

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/681,274	10/09/2003	Yoshikazu Ohara	4074-8	5972	
23117 75	90 03/31/2006		EXAMINER		
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			DICKEY, THOMAS L		
901 NORTH GI ARLINGTON,	LEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOC VA 22203)R	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2826	•	
			DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/681,274	OHARA, YOSHIKAZU		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Thomas L. Dickey	2826		

Advisory Action	10/681,274	OHARA, YOSHIKAZU					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Thomas L. Dickey	2826					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 17 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: 	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c se with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MEED 7.	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.				
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropring the fee. The appropri	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	ecause				
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co. (b) ☒ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo 		TE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.					
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		mpliant Amendment ((PTOL-324).				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate,	•					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 4-6 and 13.	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil vided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,7-12 and 26-30</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered and necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ied.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowar	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	o(s)	•				
Valla floods			,				
Thomas L. Dickey							

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2826

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: It is argued, at page 7 of the remarks, that "Claim 1 requires that only the region of the semiconductor chip that corresponds to the portion where the groove is formed is flexible." In other words (words Applicant has used before in claims 27-30) that "areas of the semiconductor chip where no groove is formed are not flexible." However, as explained in the final rejection with regard to claims 27-30 (claims Applicant now offers to cancel in response to this explanation), there is no support in the application as filed for a claim that any part of the semiconductor chip is not flexible. Therefore proposed claims 1-3 and 7-12 fail to meet the written description requirement of §112 paragraph 1.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It is argued, at page 8 of the remarks, that "A 'groove' is a 'long narrow furrow or channel.' See The American Heritage Dictionary, Third Edition, Office Edition (1994). This common well known and ordinary definition of 'groove' clearly does not read on only the portion under element 912 in Fig. 41 of Okada, because this small area in Okada is not long and narrow. Thus, the Office Action's attempt to exclude areas 961-964 from the alleged 'groove." However, The Examiner relies not on figure 41 (which Applicant argues fails to disclose the claimed groove), but on figure 40. It would make no sense for the Examiner to rely on figure 41, because the Examiner specifically states that the grooves are "seen under a portion 912 of the element non-forming region 912-913." In the plan view of figure 41 only the top of portion 912 is visible. Only in the section view of figure 40 can one see the grooves under portion 912. Note, column 21 lines 5-9, that Okada et al. specifically disclose forming, in Okada et al.'s word, "grooves" formed at the lower surface of a region of a main substrate by, for example, etching, cause the thickness of that region to be thin, thus allowing the region of the main substrate formed over the grooves to have flexibility relative to the rest. Although Okada et el. simply draws the grooves under flexible portions 912 in figure 40 without commenting on their purpose or even their very existence, it is clear from context that they are grooves.